

Application No. 09/748,118
Amendment Dated September 17, 2003
Reply to Office Action of June 17, 2003

Docket No. YHK-0059

REMARKS

Claims 1-38 are pending in this application. By this Amendment, claims 2-5 and 8-12 are amended and claims 13-38 are added. Support for new claims 13-38 can be found in the original disclosure including the original claims and figures. No new matter is added. Applicant notes that as at least claims 1, 3-6 and 7 are not amended, should a new Office Action be issued with a new reference, such Office Action should be made non-final. Reconsideration in view of the above amendments and following Remarks is respectfully requested.

I. 35 U.S.C. § 102(e)

The Office Action rejects claim 9 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) over Kanazawa et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,429,834 B1, hereinafter Kanazawa). Since Kanazawa fails to disclose or suggest all of the features of the claim, the rejection is respectfully traversed.

Applicant respectfully submits that Kanazawa discloses the plasma display panel which includes address, X and Y electrodes where a prescribed erase pulse and a sustain discharge pulse are applied to X and Y electrodes in a sustain discharge period. See Kanazawa abstract. Further, Kanazawa discloses that because Kanazawa's plasma display device selectively erases by applying the prescribed erase pulse, only cells where a scale of a sustained discharge is large enough to generate sufficient luminance can compensate such luminance. Thus, when the sustained

Application No. 09/748,118
Amendment Dated September 17, 2003
Reply to Office Action of June 17, 2003

Docket No. YHK-0059

discharge due to the sustained discharge pulse is small enough, the discharge will not generate a sufficient luminance. See Kanazawa Abstract.

However, Kanazawa fails to disclose or suggest, as recited in claim 9, at least the feature of applying a pulse to a dummy electrode located in a non-display area outside a circumference of a display area of a plasma display panel. The Office Action states that Kanazawa “teaches at least two dummy electrodes (auxiliary electrodes 23a and 23b) (col. 4, lines 7-18).” See the Office Action dated June 17, 2003, page 3, last paragraph. However, the “auxiliary electrodes 23a and 23b” are merely portions of the X and Y electrodes 11, 12 and are not dummy electrodes.

The Office Action further states that Kanazawa does not expressly teach dummy electrodes provided at non-display areas, but states with respect to claims 1-5 and 10-11 that Weber (U.S. Patent No. 5,430,458, hereinafter Weber) teaches a plasma display panel that includes dummy electrodes at the non-display area (col. 6, line 57 through col. 7, line 20). See the Office Action dated June 17, 2003, page 3, last paragraph to page 4, first paragraph. In this passage of Weber, Weber states that dummy addresses are used to eliminate flicker and that dummy address pulses must generate sufficient gas discharge activity in the plasma panel to emit a reasonable amount of light in the selected cells. See Weber col. 6, line 57 to col. 7, line 13. Thus, the dummy address pulses are not within non-display areas, as recited in claim 9, and are

Application No. 09/748,118
Amendment Dated September 17, 2003
Reply to Office Action of June 17, 2003

Docket No. YHK-0059

clearly within display areas as Weber requires that the dummy address pulses generate sufficient discharge activity to emit a reasonable amount of light in the selected cells. Therefore, Weber does not disclose or suggest applying a pulse to a dummy electrode located in a non-display area outside a circumference of a display area of said plasma display panel, as recited in claim 9.

For at least the reasons set forth above, Applicant respectfully submits that claim 9 is allowable. Withdrawal of the rejection is respectfully requested.

II. 35 U.S.C. § 103(a)

A. Claims 1-5 and 10-11

The Office Action claims 1-5 and 10-11 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) over Kanazawa in view of Weber. Since the references, alone or in combination, fail to disclose or suggest all of the features of the claims, the rejection is respectfully traversed.

Applicant respectfully submits that for at least the reasons discussed above with respect to claim 9 and Kanazawa and Weber, the references do not disclose or suggest the feature of at least two dummy electrodes in a non-display area, as recited in claim 1. Further, for the reasons discussed above, Kanazawa and Weber do not disclose or suggest at least the features of claim 9.

Application No. 09/748,118
Amendment Dated September 17, 2003
Reply to Office Action of June 17, 2003

Docket No. YHK-0059

For the reasons discussed above, Applicant respectfully submits that claims 1 and 9 are allowable. Claims 2-5 depend from claim 1 and claims 10-11 depend from claim 9, and are allowable for at least the same reasons, as well as their added features, and the combinations thereof. Withdrawal of the rejection is respectfully requested.

B. Claims 6-8 and 12

The Office Action rejects claims 6-8 and 12 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) over Nguyen et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,181,305, hereinafter Nguyen). From the discussion in the Office Action, Applicant assumes that these claims are rejected also in view of Weber. Since Nguyen and Weber, alone or in combination, fail to disclose or suggest all the features of the claims, the rejection is respectfully traversed.

Applicant respectfully submits that Nguyen appears to disclose a plasma display panel with pairs of sustain electrodes X,Y and address electrodes A. See Nguyen Fig. 1B. However, Nguyen fails to disclose or suggest, as recited in claim 6, at least the feature of a dummy electrode driver for applying a dummy pulse to dummy electrodes such that dummy electrodes formed at the non-display area can cause a first auxiliary discharge in the address interval.

Application No. 09/748,118
Amendment Dated September 17, 2003
Reply to Office Action of June 17, 2003

Docket No. YHK-0059

Rather, Nguyen fails to disclose or suggest any dummy electrode driver, let alone one for applying a dummy pulse to dummy electrodes such that dummy electrodes formed at non-display areas can cause a first auxiliary discharge in an address interval.

Weber fails to cure the deficiencies of Nguyen as mentioned above, Weber discloses dummy address electrodes in display areas and therefore does not disclose or suggest dummy electrodes form at non-display areas.

With respect to claim 12, Nguyen also fails to disclose or suggest, as recited in claim 12, at least the feature of applying a dummy pulse to dummy electrodes positioned at a non-display area to cause a first auxiliary discharge for supplying discharge cells with charged particles. As mentioned above, neither Nguyen nor Weber disclose or suggest dummy electrodes in non-display areas.

For at least the reasons set forth above, Applicant respectfully submits that claims 6 and 12 are allowable. Claims 7 and 8 depend from claim 6, and is allowable for at least the same reasons, as well as their added features and the combinations thereof. Withdrawal of the rejection is respectfully requested.

Application No. 09/748,118
Amendment Dated September 17, 2003
Reply to Office Action of June 17, 2003

Docket No. YHK-0059

III. New Claims

By this Amendment, claims 13-38 are added to the application. Claims 13-38 broadly recite features of the preferred embodiment(s). It is respectfully submitted that the new claims are allowable over the references of record for at least the reasons discussed above in connection with claims 1-12.

CONCLUSION

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, it is respectfully submitted that the application is in condition for allowance. If the Examiner believes that any additional changes would place the application in better condition for allowance, the Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned attorney, **Laura L. Lee**, at the telephone number listed below.

To the extent necessary, a petition for an extension of time under 37 C.F.R. 1.136 is hereby made. Please charge any shortage in fees due in connection with the filing of this,

Application No. 09/748,118
Amendment Dated September 17, 2003
Reply to Office Action of June 17, 2003

Docket No. YHK-0059

concurrent and future replies, including extension of time fees, to Deposit Account 16-0607 and
please credit any excess fees to such deposit account.

Respectfully submitted,
FLESHNER & KIM, LLP

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to be 'D. Kim', written over the printed name of Daniel Y.J. Kim.

Daniel Y.J. Kim, Esq.
Registration No. 36,186
Laura L. Lee, Esq.
Registration No. 48,752

P.O. Box 221200
Chantilly, VA 20153-1200
703 502-9440 DYK/LLL:knv
Date: SEPTEMBER 17, 2003